

Re: Peterson's Death Sentence

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2005-01/8137.html>

From: Parse Tree (*account_at_domain.extension*)

Date: 01/29/05

Date: Sat, 29 Jan 2005 19:51:30 GMT

Noah Roberts wrote:

> *Kevin Aylward wrote:*

>

>> *Yes. I have already addressed this, with commandment 11. Sure, if the*

>> *only way you can salvage gods, is to throw absolutely *everything**

>> *away, i.e. allow contradictions, then my argument fails.*

>>

>> *And you believe that this is a good refutation of the argument?*

>>

>> *Stand up and smell the roses.*

>

>

> *That isn't the only one. You don't address this one either:*

>

> *If God is omnipotent he can give up his omnipotence. Therefore he can*

> *create a rock that is too heavy for himself to lift because by creating*

> *that rock he gives up his power to lift it. However, as it stands he*

> *could lift any such rock. This solution might not hold...*

He can't give up his omnipotence, because that would indicate that he's not all powerful in all time, and thus not all powerful. Another contradiction indicating that he cannot exist.

> *There is also the completely ridiculous but also completely logical and*

> *scientific argument that God and a rock he can both lift and not lift*

> *can exist so long as we don't observe it.*

It's still illogical with conventional logic.

> *And since he is omnipotent he*

> *can forever keep us from observing this. The cat is both dead and not*

> *dead.*

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Schrödinger's_cat

"Contrary to popular belief, Schrödinger did not intend this thought experiment to indicate that he believed that the dead-alive cat would actually exist; rather he considered the quantum mechanical theory to be

incomplete and not representative of reality in this case. Since a cat clearly must either be alive or dead (there is no state between alive and dead, e.g. half-dead) surely the same must be true of the nucleus. It must be either decayed or not decayed."

- > *Then there is the statement, which is similar to mine, that if you don't*
- > *already assume God cannot do the logically impossible then the question*
- > *is meaningless and no logically impossible task is even being set forth.*

The fact that you're claiming that god can do the logically impossible demonstrates the very fact that you agree that he's logically impossible. How can you say something is logically impossible and then deny that he's logically impossible? That's nonsense.

- > *Then the problem compounds if you add other branches of logic instead of*
- > *just deductive.*

Which branches of logic are not deductive?

- > *The rock cannot be both created and not created so long*
- > *as you can prove that it can't. Since any proof of that would*
- > *necessarily have to go against the definition of omnipotent (as defined)*
- > *it cannot be proven.*

No, you're trying to redefine the system itself.

- > *You can also trivialize the centuries of debate about this and claim*
- > *that your reasoning overpowers all that, but that makes your argument*
- > *trivial.*

What debate? It's been proven, and then there are people that make feeble attempts to pretend that it has not been proven. There is no possible way to reject it, as even the intuitionists would concede that it has been proven according to conventional logic.